

Appl. No. 10/788830

REMARKS

The following remarks are in response to the Office Action mailed on September 21, 2004. Upon entrance of the amendments set out above, Claims 38-52 remain pending in this application.

Claims 38, 39, 40-44, 46-50, and 52 were rejected as being anticipated by Toth (4288682). Claims 40 and 51 were rejected as being obvious over Toth (4288682). Claim 45 was rejected as being obvious over Toth (4288682) in view of Gilliland (5136139). Response is hereby made to these rejections.

Three independent claims are pending: 38, 47 and 49. Each includes language that the wire feeding has a run-in speed and a welding speed. Moreover, the run-in speed is a set percentage of the welding speed. The word "set" is used to indicate that a change in the welding speed results in a change in the run-in speed, to maintain the percentage. The independent claims have been amended to make this explicit and more clear. Each independent claim now includes language that **"a change in the weld wire speed set point effects a like-change in the run-in wire speed set point to maintain the set percentage"**.


The Examiner correctly recognized that the relied upon prior art, Toth, shows a system where the weld speed and an "inching" speed are **independent**. That independence means that while some percentage relationship exists, it is not a **set percentage**. Moreover, the system of Toth clearly does not teach that a change in the welding speed result in a like-change in the inching speed to maintain the set percentage. Indeed, Toth specifically teaches the opposite. When in the inch mode, the weld speed potentiometer 56 is grounded (Col. 7, lines 45-46), Diode D17 blocks the grounded potentiometer 56 from having any effect on the inching speed. Thus, even if inching were run-in, not only

Appl. No. 10/788830

does Toth not teach the required **set percentage**, **Toth specifically teaches not to have a set percentage.**

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the application should be allowed. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned below if it will aid in the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully Submitted



George R. Corrigan, Reg. No. 34,803
Corrigan Law Office
5 Briarcliff Court
Appleton, WI 54915
(920) 954-1099

*DN*F:\WP51\DOCS\ITW\13128.02\responselA.wpd Monday, January 17, 2005 2:57PM

- 9 -